

***PLEASE RETURN THE REVIEW SHEET TO THE GROUP PARALEGAL WITH THE FILE WHEN THE CORRECTIONS HAVE BEEN COMPLETED OR A NEW TERMINAL DISCLAIMER IS RECEIVED

T.D. INFORMAL MEMODO NOT MAIL THIS MEMO TO APPLICANT.....
DATE: 10-26-93

TO: Examiner: a. Marschel Appl. S.N.: 071130, 070
From: D. Moffett, Paralegal Art Unit: 1807
SUBJECT: Decision on Terminal Disclaimer (T.D.) filed: 10-07-93
PARALEGAL SPECIALIST

INSTRUCTIONS: I have reviewed the submitted T.D. with the results as set forth below. If you concur, please use the appropriate form paragraphs identified in this informal memo in your next Office action to notify applicant about the T.D. If you disagree with my analysis or have any Q's at all about the acceptability of the T.D., please see me or our Special Program Examiner. THIS MEMO IS AN INFORMAL, INTERNAL MEMO ONLY. IT SHOULD NOT BE MAILED TO APPLICANT.

☒ The T.D. is PROPER and has been recorded. (See ¶ 14.23). *copy of assignment + 3.73 attached to papers dated 10/9/93*

☐ The T.D. is NOT PROPER and has not been accepted for the reason(s) checked below. (See ¶14.24):

☐ The recording fee of \$_____ has not been submitted nor is there any authorization in the application file for the use of a deposit account. (See ¶14.25).

☐ The T.D. does not satisfy Rule 321(a) in that the person who has signed the T.D. has not stated the extent of his/her interest (and/or the extent of the interest of the business entity represented by the signature) in the application/patent (See ¶14.26 and 14.26.1).

☐ The T.D. lacks the enforceable only during common ownership clause - needed to overcome a double patenting rejection, Rule 321(b). (See ¶14.27, 14.27.1).

☐ It is directed to a particular claim or claims, which is not acceptable since "the disclaimer must be of a terminal portion of the term of the entire patent to be granted." (MPEP 1490) (See ¶14.26, 14.26.2).

☐ The person who signed the terminal disclaimer:

☐ has failed to state his/her capacity to sign for the business entity (See ¶14.28).

☐ is not recognized as an officer of the assignee (See ¶14.29 and possibly 14.29.1).

☐ No documentary evidence of a chain of title from the original owner to assignee has been submitted, nor is the reel and frame number specified as to where such evidence is recorded in the Office. 37 CFR 3.73(b). See 1140 O.G. 72. NOTE - This documentary evidence or the specifying of the reel and frame number may be found in the T.D. or in a separate paper. (See ¶14.30).

☐ No "statement" specifying that the evidentiary documents have been reviewed and certifying that, to the best of the assignee's knowledge and belief, title is in the assignee seeking to take action. 37 CFR 3.73(b). See 1140 O.G. 72. NOTE - This "statement" may be found in the T.D. or in a separate paper signed by the assignee. (See ¶14.31).

☐ The T.D. is not signed. (See ¶14.26, 14.26.3).

☐ The serial number of the application (or the number of the patent) which forms the basis for the double patenting rejection is missing or incorrect. (See ¶14.32).

☐ The serial number of this application (or the number of the patent in reexam or reissue cases) being disclaimed is missing or incorrect. (See ¶14.26, 14.26.4 or 14.26.5).

☐ The period disclaimed is incorrect or not specified. (See ¶14.27, 14.27.2 or 14.27.3).

☐ Other:

☐ Suggestion to request refund (See ¶14.36). (NOTE - if authorized, credit refund to deposit acc't and do NOT check this item.)

I have appropriately notified applicant(s) about the T.D. filed in this case.

Ex. initials and date: AM, 10-26-93

Rev. 2/9/93